

JOHN PAUL MATA.

Petitioner,

V.

**COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY,**

## Respondent.

Case No. 1:22-cv-01517-CDB (SS)

**ORDER GRANTING APPLICATION TO  
PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS AND  
DIRECTING CLERK OF COURT TO ISSUE  
SUMMONS, SCHEDULING ORDER, AND  
CONSENT OR REQUEST FOR  
REASSIGNMENT DOCUMENTS**

(ECF No. 2)

Petitioner John Paul Mata (“Petitioner”) seeks judicial review of an administrative decision of the Commissioner of Social Security denying Petitioner’s claim for disability benefits under the Social Security Act. (ECF No. 1). Pending before the Court is Petitioner’s application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. (ECF No. 2). For the following reasons, the Court finds issuance of the new case documents and Petitioner’s application to proceed *in forma pauperis* appropriate.

## I. Proceeding *in forma pauperis*

The Court may authorize the commencement of an action without prepayment of fees “by a person who submits an affidavit that includes a statement of all assets such person...possesses (and) that the person is unable to pay such fees or give security therefor.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). Here, the Court reviewed the financial status affidavit (ECF No. 2) and finds the requirements of

1 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a) are satisfied.

2 **II. Screening Requirement**

3 When a party seeks to proceed *in forma pauperis*, the Court is required to review the  
4 complaint and shall dismiss the complaint, or portion thereof, if it is “frivolous, malicious or fails  
5 to state a claim upon which relief may be granted; or...seeks monetary relief from a defendant  
6 who is immune from such relief.” 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(b) & (e)(2). A petitioner’s claim is  
7 frivolous “when the facts alleged rise to the level of the irrational or the wholly incredible,  
8 whether or not there are judicially noticeable facts available to contradict them.” *Denton v.*  
9 *Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 32-33 (1992).

10 **III. Pleading Standards**

11 A complaint must include a statement affirming the court’s jurisdiction, “a short and plain  
12 statement of the claim showing the pleader is entitled to relief; and...a demand for the relief  
13 sought, which may include relief in the alternative or different types of relief.” Fed. R. Civ. P.  
14 8(a). The purpose of the complaint is to give the defendant fair notice of the claims, and the  
15 grounds upon which the complaint stands. *Swierkiewicz v. Sorema N.A.*, 534 U.S. 506, 512  
16 (2002). As set forth by the Supreme Court:

17 Rule 8 does not require detailed factual allegations, but it demands more than an  
18 unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation. A pleading that  
19 offers labels and conclusions or a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of  
action will not do. Nor does a complaint suffice if it tenders naked assertions devoid  
of further factual enhancement.

20 *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678-79 (2009) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted).  
21 Vague and conclusory allegations do not support a cause of action. *Ivey v. Board of Regents*,  
22 673 F.2d 266, 268 (9th Cir. 1982). The *Iqbal* Court clarified further,

23 [A] complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to “state a  
24 claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S.  
25 544, 570 (2009). A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual  
26 content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is  
27 liable for the misconduct alleged. *Id.* at 556. The plausibility standard is not akin  
to a “probability requirement,” but it asks for more than a sheer possibility that a  
defendant has acted unlawfully. *Id.* Where a complaint pleads facts that are  
“merely consistent with” a defendant’s liability, it “stops short of the line between  
possibility and plausibility of “entitlement to relief.”

1 *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 679. When factual allegations are well-pled, a court should assume their truth  
2 and determine whether the facts would make the plaintiff entitled to relief; legal conclusions are  
3 not entitled to the same assumption of truth. *Id.* The Court may grant leave to amend a complaint  
4 to the extent deficiencies of the complaint can be cured by an amendment. *Lopez v. Smith*, 203  
5 F.3d 1122, 1127-28 (9th Cir. 2000) (en banc).

6 **IV. Discussion and Analysis**

7 Petitioner seeks review of a decision by the Commissioner of Social Security denying  
8 disability benefits. The Court may have jurisdiction pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), which  
9 provides:

10 Any individual after any final decision of the Commissioner made after a hearing  
11 to which he was a party, irrespective of the amount in controversy, may obtain a  
12 review of such decision by a civil action commenced within sixty days after the  
13 mailing to him of such decision or within such further time as the Commissioner  
14 may allow. Such action shall be brought in the district court of the Untied States for  
15 the judicial district in which the plaintiff resides or has his principal place of  
business...The court shall have power to enter, upon the pleadings and transcript  
of the record, a judgment affirming, modifying, or reversing the decision of the  
Commissioner of Social Security, with or without remanding the cause for a  
rehearing.

16 *Id.* Except as provided by statute, “[n]o findings of fact or decision of the Commissioner shall  
17 be reviewed by any person, tribunal, or governmental agency.” 42 U.S.C. § 405(h).

18 Petitioner seeks to appeal the final administrative decision denying an application for  
19 benefits. (ECF No. 1 at ¶ 2). Petitioner reports the Appeals Council issued a notice denying a  
20 request for review of the decision on September 23, 2022. *Id.* Thus, Petitioner’s complaint is  
21 timely. Petitioner states he resides in Modesto, California, County of Stanislaus. *Id.* at ¶ 4.  
22 Therefore, the Court has jurisdiction over this action.

23 **V. Conclusion and Order**

24 Petitioner’s complaint states a cognizable claim for review of the administrative decision  
25 denying Social Security benefits. ACCORDINGLY, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that  
26 Petitioner’s application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (ECF No. 2) is GRANTED. The Clerk of  
27 Court is directed to issue the following: 1) a Summons; 2) the Scheduling Order; 3) the Order re

1 Consent or Request for Reassignment; and 4) a Consent to Assignment or Request for  
2 Reassignment form.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 Dated: November 30, 2022

  
5 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28